

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO**

---

**LEON ROMERO, et al.,**

**No. CIV 02-1102 BB/DJS**

**FRANK ARAGON, et al.,**

**No. CIV 02-1104 BB/ DJS**

**BRIAN CROCKETT, et al.,**

**No. CIV 02-1106 BB/LCS**

**MICHAEL CASILLAS, et al.,**

**No. CIV 02-1190 BB/DJS**

**Plaintiffs,**

**v.**

**GARY JOHNSON, et al.,**

**Defendants.**


**MEMORANDUM OPINION  
AND  
ORDER AWARDING COSTS AND ATTORNEYS' FEES**

**THIS MATTER having been previously before the Court on the Order to Show Cause on why the State Defendants' motion to dismiss should not be granted, and the Court having entertained briefs and oral argument on January 30, 2003, it then ordered Defendants to submit an appropriate bill for costs and attorneys' fees. *See* Mem. Op. and Order of Feb. 7, 2003. Plaintiffs' counsel was granted until February 24, 2003, to respond, but in typical fashion he electronically filed a two-page response on February 25 at 3:34 a.m. This pleading contains no citation to legal authority or rational legal argument, but merely states objection "to the outrageously expensive cost**

bill of attorney Luis Robles.” Also consistent with the prior practice of Plaintiffs’ counsel, he attempts to shift the burden to this Court by attempting to incorporate his “Brief on Identical Issues” presented to Judge Parker in *Torres v. Johnson*, No. CIV 02-1191 (D.N.M.). Not surprisingly, when obtained from Court files, Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Attorney Luis Robles’ Application for Attorneys’ fees and Costs in *Torres* appears to have no relevance other than involving the same defense counsel. Therefore, this Court declines the invitation of Plaintiffs’ counsel to do the necessary legal research and analysis to advance arguments for his clients. The Court awards the Defendants the sum of \$4,207.85 in each of these cases. *See generally Adamson v. Bowen*, 855 F.2d 668 (10th Cir. 1988); *White v. General Motors Corp.*, 908 F.2d 675 (10th Cir. 1990); *Schrag v. Dinges*, 150 F.R.D. 664 (D. Kan. 1993); *Williams v. Lane*, 96 F.R.D. 383 (N.D. Ill. 1982).

**SO ORDERED.**

**Dated at Albuquerque this 10<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2003.**

  
**BRUCE D. BLACK**  
**United States District Judge**

**For Plaintiffs:**

**Paul Livingston, Albuquerque, NM**

**For Defendants:**

**Luis Robles, FRENCH & ASSOCIATES, Albuquerque, NM**